

Civil Rights Division, and that is an unfortunate development. It is unfortunate because, first, all he is asking is to be judged fairly. That is all he has ever asked in his life. And second, the things they are saying about him really do stretch the truth.

One of the leading conservative columnists in America, George Will, a man whom I really respect not just because he was raised and went to school in Illinois but because I think he is a pretty bright fellow, wrote a column in the middle of October and said we should turn down Bill Lee as "a payback"—his words, "a payback"—because the Senate Democrats, when they controlled the Judiciary Committee, turned down one of the civil rights appointments of a Republican President 10 years ago.

Please, let us not do that to Mr. Lee. Let us not do that to the Senate. Let us give him his chance to stand on his own feet and have an opportunity to serve this country. And so I hope those of you who think that when the Senate goes home and the House adjourns our work is done will realize there are still many men and women waiting for confirmation and one of the most important and highest is Bill Lann Lee. He would be the highest-ranking Asian American ever appointed, and I am glad that the President has named him and I hope that we can find just two, just two Republican Senators on the Judiciary Committee who will join the Democrats in supporting his nomination.

CONSOLIDATION OF FEDERAL FOOD INSPECTION SERVICES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced with Senator TORRICELLI a bill, which I hope the Senator from Minnesota will join me in sponsoring, that would consolidate all of the food inspection services of the Federal Government in one independent agency.

Mr. President, 33 million Americans each year have some sort of a foodborne illness, and out of that number some 9,000 will die. You read about the cases, whether it is E. coli or salmonella. We have a good food inspection system but it can be much better. Our food inspection system evolved from Upton Sinclair's novel "The Jungle," when we decided the Federal Government had to step in and make sure the food, meat in particular, that came to our table was safe for our families. But now I am afraid we have gone overboard. We have 12 different Federal agencies involved in food inspection—12—6 in a major way.

I am joining with Congressman VIC FAZIO of California to consolidate these into one independent agency which will be guided by the best science in keeping food safe for Americans. I hope that this, too, will be part of our agenda next year when we return to Washington, DC. It is an important issue, not just for the industries that are affected

but for every family that wants to be certain when they buy that meat or poultry, fish or whatever product it might be, fruits and vegetables and beyond, it is safe for their family to consume.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Might I ask what the parliamentary situation is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Chair's understanding we are in morning business. Senators are allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Before I start, I also wanted to find out how long we will be in morning business and whether or not there will be opportunities to introduce amendments to the fast-track bill?

In other words, I understand the amendment will be laid aside, but I want to know whether there are opportunities to introduce the amendments to fast track.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a parliamentary issue that will be handled by the majority leader. We are not prepared to answer that question.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will just say in the Chamber and I will check with the leader, I do have an amendment on human rights that I would like to offer. We may or may not get to fast track, but this would be an opportunity I think to have the discussion.

WELFARE, HEALTH CARE, AND CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I wanted to take this time Sunday afternoon as we approach the end of this session to talk about some unfinished business for the Congress and I think for the Nation. I really was moved, and I do not usually use that word, by the eloquence of my colleague, Senator DURBIN, from Illinois. As I came in, I heard Senator DURBIN talk about children and talk about early years and talk about early childhood development and talk about whether or not we as a nation are going to make a commitment to affordable child care.

I want to talk about a really difficult issue for the Senate, for the Congress, and I think for the White House, and when we come back for me this will be one of the first items of business. I want us to have discussion and I would like to see whether or not we would be willing to perhaps take some important action.

I am talking about the bill that was passed which was called welfare reform. Mr. President, some of what was in that bill represented over \$50 billion

of cuts in the name of deficit reduction in the major food nutrition program in the country, food stamps—20 percent cut for families, most of them working families, most of the recipients children. And the other part was the cuts in benefits to legal immigrants, some of which has been corrected, some of which has not.

What worries me—and I have traveled the country and spent quite a bit of time in low-income communities. I haven't just focused on welfare, but I have been to the delta in Mississippi with Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON; I have been to eastern Kentucky, to Letcher County, Whitesburg, KY; I have been to Chicago in housing projects, and, of course, I have been in Minnesota, both urban and rural, and I have been to L.A., East L.A., and Watts. One of the things that worries me is that I see in many articles and too much of the media coverage and certainly too much of what I hear from both Democrats and Republicans in Washington that welfare reform has been a success as defined by reduction of caseload. Any Democrat, any Republican, or any fool can knock people off the welfare rolls. That has nothing to do with reform. The only way reform can be defined is not by reduction of caseload but by reduction of poverty. Are these families, in the main headed by women and children, better off?

I heard my colleague from Illinois talk about child care, and if my colleague was here I would tell him about some just very emotional experiences that I have had, meeting with some of the women who have now been told they are to work, and they work. But their concern is about what happens to their children. You know, just because they are poor, just because they are welfare mothers, doesn't make them, or doesn't make their children, any less worthy, any less important.

In Los Angeles, for example, in L.A., one city, they have a waiting list of 30,000 families for affordable child care. That is before the welfare bill. The question I ask colleagues is, where are these children? Fine, the mothers are now working. Do we know where the children are? Where are they? Who is taking care of them? Is it developmental child care? Is it just custodial? Or are they even in harm's way? We don't know. But we should know. We passed the legislation.

I met a woman, and this story of this one mother unfortunately is the story of other mothers. She said to me, "I want to work." By the way, almost all the people I meet want to work. That's a big thing to people in our country, to be able to work and make a decent wage and support your family. And also to be able to give your children the care you know they need and deserve. But I am meeting some of these mothers. We told them we would sort of delegate this to the States and they would work.

Here is what they say to me, what this one mother in L.A. said. I then visited actually where she lived, public